

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheets includes changes to FIGS. 5-14. These sheets, which include FIGS. 5-14, replace the original sheets including FIGS. 5-14, respectively.

Attachments: Replacement Sheet – FIG. 5
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 6
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 7
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 8
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 9
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 10
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 11
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 12
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 13
Replacement Sheet – FIG. 14

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application. No new matter has been added to the present application. Claims 1-23 were rejected in the Office Action. Claims 1 and 12 have been amended. No new claims have been added and no claims have been canceled in this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are pending herein. Claims 1-23, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance upon review and acceptance of these remarks. Favorable action is respectfully requested.

Applicants' representative thanks Examiner Arani for granting a telephonic interview on July 2, 2007. During the interview, the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in the Office Action dated May 9, 2007 were discussed. Applicants' representative discussed differences between the claimed invention and the cited reference, namely U.S. Patent No. 5,845,260 to Nakano et al. (the "Nakano reference"). In particular, Applicants' representative noted that some embodiments of the claimed invention are directed to regulating a child's activities by allowing the child to earn credits by performing work (e.g., homework or housework) and redeem those credits in the form of fun activities. In contrast, the Nakano reference discusses tracking monetary credits that allow a child to purchase some form of entertainment and is not concerned with regulating a child's fun activities based on performed work activities. Potential claim amendments were also discussed to clarify the differences.

Amendments to the Specification

Paragraph [0003] of the specification has been amended to correct minor editorial problems. The amendments include removing the unnecessary words "that" and to change "filtering software stored implemented" to "filtering software implemented." Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment overcomes the objection to the Specification.

Paragraph [0008] of the specification has been amended to include the word “with” to correct a minor grammatical error.

Paragraph [0057] of the specification has also been amended to add the words “to be” to correct a minor grammatical error.

Paragraphs [0044], [0047], [0053], and [0056] have been amended in order that the descriptions in the Specification correspond to the correct numbers in the figures. No new matter has been added.

Amendments to the Drawings

The Office Action objected to FIGS. 5-14 indicating that the drawings have poor reproduction quality. Accordingly, replacement drawing sheets including FIGS. 5-14 are submitted herewith. No new matter has been introduced with the replacement drawings sheets. Applicants respectfully submit that the replacement drawing sheets including FIGS. 5-14 overcome the drawing objections.

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1 and 12 have been amended herein. Care has been exercised to avoid the introduction of new matter. Support for the amendments to claims 1 and 12 may be found in the Specification, for example, at paragraphs [0028] and [0041]-[0044].

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 102

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdeggal Brothers v. Union Oil co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the . . .

claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 2 USPQ 2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). *See also*, MPEP § 2131.

Claims 1-23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Nakano reference. As the Nakano reference describes a different type of system, the claims have been amended to more accurately describe the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Independent claim 1 recites a system for regulating a child’s activities by allowing the child to earn credits by performing work and redeem those credits in the form of fun activities. The claimed system is directed to motivating a child to perform some type of work activity (e.g., homework or housework) by rewarding that child with some type of fun activity. Accordingly, claim 1 has been amended to more accurately describe the way in which a child earns credits by performing work. In contrast, while the system in the Nakano reference allows a child to spend monetary credits to receive some form of entertainment, it does not encourage a child to earn credits in the same way recited in independent claim 1. *See Nakano*, col. 3, lines 16-20; col. 6, lines 3-7. The Nakano reference simply discusses giving credits to a child who wins some type of game, and it does not allow or encourage the child to earn credits by performing work. *See id.* at col. 6, lines 3-7. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 recites a different type of system for earning credits than that discussed in the Nakano reference.

Independent claim 12 describes a method for regulating a child’s activities by allowing the child to earn credits by performing work and redeem credits for fun activities. In particular, independent claim 12 has been amended to recite “tracking credits earned in response to a child’s performance of selected work activities.” As such, the amended claim more

accurately recites a method for encouraging a child to perform work. The child earns credits redeemable for fun activities by performing work. As described above with respect to claim 1, the Nakano reference fails to describe giving credits to a child for performing work activities.

Additionally, claim 12 has been amended to more fully describe the method in which work activities are defined. An adult responsible for the child defines the work activities in which credits can be earned. Specifically, the work activities are defined by a parent, guardian, babysitter, or teacher of the child. In contrast, the Nakano reference allows a child to earn credits by winning some type of game. *See id.* at col. 6, lines 3-7. The Nakano reference does not allow an adult responsible for the child to define the way in which credits are earned. Therefore, amended claim 12 describes a different method for defining work activities and earning credits than that discussed in the Nakano reference.

As such, it is respectfully submitted that the Nakano reference fails to describe, either expressly or inherently, each and every element of independent claims 1 and 12, and, as such, claims 1 and 12 are not anticipated by the Nakano reference. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Claims 1 and 12 are believed to be in condition for allowance and such favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-11 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 1 and accordingly, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance after the amendment of claim 1 for at least the above-cited reasons. Claims 13-23 depend directly or indirectly upon claim 12 and accordingly, these claims are believed to be in condition for allowance after the amendment of claim 12 for at least the above-cited reasons. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections of these claims as well.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-23 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of claims 1-23. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-559-2021 or jgolian@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required (or to credit any overpayment) to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/John S. Golian/

John S. Golian
Reg. No. 54,702

JSG/drb
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550